

676. c. 5
3

S U P P L E M E N T
T O
C R I T I C A S A C R A;
I N W H I C H

The PRINCIPLES of that TREATISE
are fully confirmed;

A N D T H E
O B J E C T I O N S of Mr. RAPHAEL BARUH
clearly answered.

By the Rev. Dr. H E N R Y O W E N,
Rector of St. OLAVE, HART-STREET,
And Fellow of the Royal Society.

L O N D O N:
Printed by W. BOWYER and J. NICHOLS,
M D C C L X X V.

SUPPLEMENT

TO

CRITICA SACRA;

SUPPLEMENT

IN WHICH

THE PRINCIPLES OF THAT TREATISE

ARE FULLY CONTAINED;

AND THE

OBJECTIONS OF M. RAPHAEL BARNI

ARE FULLY ANSWERED.

By the Rev. Dr. HENRY OWEN,

Professor of Divinity, Hart Street,

And Fellow of the Royal Society.

L O N D O N :

Printed by W. Bowyer and J. Nichols,

MDCCLXXV.



SUPPLEMENT

T O

CRITICA SACRA.

THE Author of the *Critica Sacra* little
 T thought, when he penned that Treatise,
 that he should ever have been obliged to
 appear publickly in its defence. The principles he
 proceeded upon, were, in his own opinion, so simple
 and obvious; and the conclusions drawn from them
 so just and natural, that he verily believed, they
 could never be called in question. But herein, it
 seems, he was greatly mistaken. For almost every
 Position he has laid down, has been since controverted
 by a learned Jew, in a professed *Examination* of that
 Treatise*.

The chief Design of the *Critica Sacra* was to re-
 commend to the practice of the Hebraical Reader an
 accurate Collation of the parallel Texts. And such a
 Collation was more particularly recommended to him,

* See *Critica Sacra examined*, &c. by Mr. RAPHAEL BARUH.

because it appeared to be one of the best and likeliest methods, as well to *discover* as to *correct* the Mistakes, occasioned by the negligence or ignorance of Transcribers. But the learned *Examiner*, Mr. *Raphael Baruh*, strenuously opposes this notion : and “ aims, “ on the contrary to shew, that no passage, or even “ a single word, or letter of Scripture, should be “ deemed corrupted on the sole authority of parallel “ Texts *.”

As these opinions are so widely different, and cannot possibly stand together ; let us now see on which side the Truth lies, by applying them both to a proper Test : I mean, the Test of *Scripture* and *Reason*. But before I advance to the application of *Scripture*, it will be necessary to premise some things concerning it ; in which it may be supposed we cannot differ : and which therefore may serve as the proper *Basis* of our future Disquisitions.

I assume it then as an indisputable *Axiom*,

1. That the several Books of the Old Testament came originally from the hands of their respective authors in a state of *absolute purity* and *perfection*.
2. That these inspired authors, in their several *representations* of the same facts, were always and every where (so far as they represented them) intirely *consistent* both with *themselves*, and with *each other* : and consequently, that there were no *real differences*, no *glaring contradictions*, in their *accounts* ; respecting ei-

* Pref. p. ii.

ther

ther the *circumstances* of the transactions, the *dates* of the occurrences, or the *known state* of the times.—All this is necessarily implied in the nature of *Inspiration*. For *Truth* can be but *one*: And “the Spirit of Truth” cannot *contradict* himself.

Corollary. If then it appears from the present Text, that the recorded *circumstances* of several transactions are *inconsistent*—that the *dates* of facts are often *different*—and that particular parts of the history often *contradict* the known, natural *state* of things; what else can we conclude, but that the Text is, in such places, *corrupted*; and should be set right by the correspondent accounts, and other collateral evidences?

But this, perhaps, may be looked upon, as urging a conclusion too abruptly. Let us therefore proceed in a more leisurely manner.

Now, though it be acknowledged, that the Books of Scripture were perfect *at first*, as being all written by *inspired* persons; yet, when they came to be *afterwards* transcribed by *frail* and *fallible* men, can it ever be supposed, that these *Transcripts* were *equally pure, equally perfect* with the *archetypal* copies? that no *words* were *overlooked*, no *errors* committed, by the several *Transcribers*? This is more than what the *Jews* themselves presume to maintain. They frankly allow, “that even at the establishment of the Canon of Scripture, some *various Readings* were found *,”

* Pref. p. ii.

—which they inserted *then* in the margin of their Bibles *, and now read instead of the Text.

As these *Keri's* or *marginal Readings* are of some consequence in the present question, it may be of use to consider them more particularly.

They are generally divided into *seven* Classes :

Class I. Where a *Letter* is *deficient* or *redundant* in the text.

Class II. Where *one* Letter is written for *another*.

Class III. Where the Letters are *misplaced* or *transposed*.

Class IV. Where a Letter is *affixed* to the *preceding* word, which ought to have been *prefixed* to the word *following*.

Class V. Where *whole words* are *written*, which are not to be read ; and, on the contrary, *whole words* are *read*, though not *written*.

Class VI. Where *two distinct* words are made *one* ; or else improperly *divided*.

These six Classes were originally founded upon, and supported by, the *various Readings* of *ancient Copies*. But,

Class VII. (*quæ voces honestiores pro obscænis legendas continet*) is a mere figment of the Jews ; and derived its origin from their false, superstitious refinement.

The Instances therefore under the *six* foregoing Heads, are so many Instances of the *Mistakes* of

* So say most of the *Jewish* Writers, upon whose principles I am obliged to argue.

Transcribers; and amount in number, collectively taken, to no less than EIGHT HUNDRED and THIRTY EIGHT*.

But are these *eight hundred and thirty eight* errors, observed and noted by the ancient *Masorites*, ALL the errors, that ever crept into the Old Testament, or are now to be found therein? Are there no *mistakes* in it of any kind:—no *defect* or *redundance*, no *change* or *transposition* of letters; no *omission*, no wrong *insertion* of words, but what these critics have already specified? Has the Text, in all *other* respects, reached our hands in its *primitive* purity?

This last question, my adversary says, he “pre- tends not to enter into†.” But why so? especially when he knows, that it is the grand, fundamental question in this Dispute—the question upon which the whole controversy chiefly turns. If he thinks, as he seems to think, the *affirmative* side defensible, let him boldly maintain it, and bring forth his strong reasons. For my own part, I espouse the *negative*—and scruple not to assert, that there are *many* errors in the *Hebrew* Text, reducible to some of the fore- mentioned Classes, which the *Masorites* have either overlooked or neglected—and which any judicious Reader, attentive to the genius and grammar of the

* *Elias Levita* reckons the *Keri's* to be in all 848: from which 10, the number contained in the 7th Class, being deducted,—the remainder, viz. 838, are the errors of Transcribers.

† *Crit. Sacra* exam. p. 1.

language, and to the nature and circumstances of things, may easily and readily discover. They occur so frequently, in one form or other, that there is no occasion to point them out. One can hardly collate two verses together, but some *variations* (arising either from a *deficiency*, *change*, or *transposition* of letters) may be discerned between the words.

These variations my opponent looks upon as *trifling*, *immaterial*, and *unworthy of notice* *. But to me they appear in another light. I cannot easily admit even of the smallest variations. The minute difference between the words מַחִיאל and מַחִיאל Gen. iv. 18; as also between פְּנִיאל and פְּנוֹאל Gen. xxxii. 30, 31; I am strongly prompted to remark as a *fault*. And I have the *Masorites* often concurring with me, though not in *these*, yet in *many* other, as *immaterial*, instances: for several of the *Keri's* are of *this* sort. And if *they* judged the authority of Manuscripts sufficient to support their marginal corrections; I think the construction and harmony of the context (where the *repeated* names are required to be exactly conformable to the *prime ones*) equally sufficient to bear me out.

“But the Text, it is said, stood as it does for upwards of 1500 years—nay, from the establishment of the canon in the time of *Exra* †”—and is therefore not to be controverted. Now, admit that it has so stood, and that it is exactly conformable to the

* *Crit. Sacra exam.* p. 9. 18. 26, &c.

† *Pref.* p. ii. vi.

canon—yet, how, or in what manner, was the *Canon* itself established? For since different Copies read differently, what gave the preference to the present text? The *Jewish* answer is, “that where the copies “read variously, those readings were preferred, and “admitted into the Text, which were authorized by “the greater number of *esteemed* copies*.”

But here we would ask—“Upon what grounds did they found the *value*?—upon what principles did they form their *estimation*, of the several copies, that lay before them?” This is a question that requires a clear and distinct solution: But to this the *Jews* never care to speak openly. However, what they are loath to declare in words, their practice has sufficiently demonstrated. It is manifest that they settled the Text, not by the superior *purity* of the Transcripts, but by the superior *number* of the *agreeing* Copies. For what else, but the *number* of Copies *so agreeing*, could induce them to retain such *wrong, ungrammatical* readings in the Text; when *other* Copies, though indeed *fewer*, presented them with the *right* and *grammatical* words; which now stand in the *margin* of their Bibles? For surely they cannot but acknowledge, that the *marginal* Readings, which they call *Keri's*, are, in general, more agreeable to the truth of Facts, more conformable to the rules of Grammar, and more correspondent to the sense of the context, than the *textual* Readings are—and therefore ought, on the

* *Crit. Sacra* exam. Pref. p. ii.

principles of *sound criticism*, to have changed places with *those* readings*; or rather, to have excluded them utterly.

But to this it is replied—"What has *criticism* to do with the *Biblical* text, established by an *inspired* person? Is *Ezra's* inspiration to be combated by human judgement?" No—But to speak freely, I doubt whether *Ezra* settled the text: nay, I will undertake to prove that he did not.

Let the *Jews* suppose, as they generally do, that *Ezra*, or any other *inspired* person, superintended the establishment of the Canon of Scripture, and the settlement of the *Hebrew* text—Upon this supposition, the following question naturally occurs: And to this question they are obliged to answer. "Was not *HIS Inspiration* (be he who they will) able to determine, between two *discordant* words, which was the *true*, and which the *false* one?" But it is visibly evident by their own adopted *marginal Readings*, by their annexed *Keri's*, that the persons who fixed the present Text were not able to determine it. For then, there would have been no *marginal Readings* or *Keri's* at all:—and yet they now stand in every Book of the Old Testament: and in the *later* Books they are more numerous and frequent than in the *former*. How could this come to pass, let me ask the *Jews*, under any supposed *Inspiration*? How could it come

* Indeed many of the *older MSS* have the *Keri's* in the text, where the *later* have them in the margin.

to pass more especially under *Ezra*, the reputed establisher of the Canon? If he could not ascertain the genuine Text of those Books, which had been written before his time; yet he must surely know what *himself* had written—and consequently settle the true reading of *his own* Book. Since this then was not the case; since his own Book is as full fraught with *Keri's*, as any Book of the same size throughout the Bible; we are hence unavoidably led to conclude, that the *Canon* was not perfected, nor the *Text* established, in *his days*: no; nor yet in any part of that time, that *his original* Copy was in being. For *then* recourse might have been had to the *genuine* text; which would have utterly excluded the *Keri's*.

But this is not all—It is clearly deducible from the genealogy of the sons of *Zerubbabel**, which is carried down to the time of *Alexander* the Great, that the Book of *Chronicles* was not written, till *many* years after *Ezra's* death; and must therefore have been added to the Canon in a still later period†.

Hence then it seems to follow, that the *Hebrew* canon was not established by *inspired* persons; but was formed by the judgement, and stands on the authority, of the ancient *Masorites*; and may therefore, I hope, be canvassed without offence, even by modern critics‡.

The

* Compare 1 *Chron.* iii. 19, &c. with *Nehem.* xii. 22, &c.

† See *Prid. Con.* Part I. B. V. p. 262. fol.

‡ I know full well, what *Jewish* and *Christian* Writers have said of *Ezra's* Edition of the *Hebrew* Scriptures; but I require

The present Text, adopted by the *western Jews*, was settled by *Rabbi BEN ASHER*, about the year of our Lord 1034—above *fourteen hundred* years after the death of *Ezra*: during which extensive, and, for the most part, calamitous period, *many* of the *best* and most *ancient* copies were probably lost; whose Readings can only be recovered by the help of those ancient *versions*, which were happily made from them before their extirpation. The *Greek* and *Syriac* versions are peculiarly excellent in this respect: for they often lead us to truer and more consistent readings than those which occupy the *Hebrew* Text.

These things considered, I cannot but esteem it a peculiar instance of good providence, and eminently conducive to the security of the text, that the *same* facts are so often recorded, the *same* histories so often repeated, in different parts of the sacred Volume. For, as this Volume was to be transmitted to future ages through the hands of different Transcribers, who were, all of them, liable to frequent mistakes; how surprizingly are the *parallel passages*, as well as the *different manuscripts*, adapted to supply each other's defects, or to confirm each other's integrity!

Different Authors, it must be allowed, had probably *different* views in writing the *same* History: and consequently might, in a certain degree, both *alter*

some better arguments, than those they have yet offered, to bring me to their opinion. Most, if not all, of what is attributed to *him*, seems to be the work of much *later* hands.

the

the diction, and *contract* or *enlarge* the substance of the narration. But nevertheless, the Truth of things manifestly required, that the *trait* and *run* of the history should be still the *same*: — that the *circumstances* should agree, or, at least, not differ—that the *dates* should correspond—and that the whole should stand in perfect *consistence* with itself, and with other collateral records. What one Author *omitted*, as implied or known—what another *added* by way of illustration—may be easily discerned; and moreover may, without the help of inspiration *, be easily distinguished from those *Errours* and *Mistakes*, which corrupt, perplex, and deface the Story.

Whenever, therefore, any *inconsistences* or *defects* appear, that manifestly require a *remedy*; from whence can we draw it with so much propriety, with so much assurance of truth and certainty, as from the *parallel* and *correspondent* texts? When we correct *thus*, we correct under the auspices of *Inspiration* — Which leads me to shew, how the *Scripture* itself plainly proves,

That some passages safely *may*, nay, necessarily *must* be corrected and supplied by their *parallels*, in order to render them *complete* and *consistent*—or to make them *express* the intended, obvious *meaning* of the Writers. I will instance in a fact of as great moment and notoriety, as any, perhaps, in the *Jewish* history: I mean the siege and demolition of *Jerusalem*, as recorded in 2 *Kings* xxv. and *Jer.* lii.

* See *Crit. Sacra* exam. p. 3.

It is related by both Authors, "that, in the reign
 "of Zedekiah, in the ninth year of his reign, in the
 "tenth month, in the tenth day of the month, Nebu-
 "chadnezzar king of Babylon came, he and all his host,
 "against Jerusalem, &c.: And the city was besieg-
 "ed unto the eleventh year of king Zedekiah. And,"
 says the author of the book of *Kings*, *בְּתֵשַׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ*
 "on the ninth day of the month, the famine prevailed
 "in the city, &c." On the ninth day of *what*
 month? Here is evidently a *date* intended: but it is
 as evident, that there is no *date* inserted. Are there
 not, therefore, some words manifestly *wanting*, to make
 up the *date*, and to express the *intention* of the
 Writer? This surely cannot be denied. Let us then
 turn to the *parallel* place, *Jer.* lii. 6. and see what
that says. Now there we read--*בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָרְבִיעִי בְּתֵשַׁעָה*
לַחֹדֶשׁ "In the fourth month, on the ninth day of the
 "month, &c." which complete the *sense* and the
date together. That *this* was originally the reading
 in *Kings*, the *Arabic* version fully proves: and so
 does the *Syriac* in part. And will any one now say,
 that our *English* Translators did wrong in supplying,
 as they have done, the *omission* in *Kings* from the
parallel place in *Jeremiah*? Nay, will any person of
 candour assert, that even an Editor of the *Hebrew*
Bible would do wrong, if he supplied this *hiatus* (but
 in a distinct, i. e. different character) from the same
Hebrew parallel? — especially when the passage must
 otherwise remain *lame* and *imperfect*?

But this is not the whole, that I have to remark on this occasion. The Author of the book of *Kings*, in conformity with the prophet *Jeremiah*, tells us, ver. 4. that “the city was broken up; and,” may be supposed to mean, that the אנשי המלחמה...הלילה, “the men of war” did something “by night, by the way of the gate, &c.” But *that something* is totally omitted; and the sense of the passage consequently maimed. Hence then we are induced again to consult the *parallel* passage, *Jer.* ver. 7. And what now does the parallel passage say, “the men of war” did? Just the very thing, that the Author of *Kings* should have said; and, I believe, did originally say—as it was the most likely thing that could possibly happen in their situation; and what the sequel of the history plainly shews must have happened—יברחו ויצאו מהעיר לילה, “*They fled, and went out of the city by night, by the way of the gate*” &c. And may not a man then—should he not indeed, even in justice to the perfection of the history, supply the defect of one of these passages from the fulness of the other? The *Chaldee paraphrase*, as well as *all the Versions*, authorises this amendment in *Kings*.

It is moreover to be observed, that the word המלך is wanting in *Kings* at the close of this verse. For, as it now stands, the verb ילך is destitute of a nominative case. See the *Vulgate* and *Arabic* versions.

All this, and a great deal more, was virtually pointed out in the Collation at the end of *Critica Sacra*;

*Sacra**; though the *Examiner* overlooked it—or it lay beyond the limits of his design.

We will therefore come into his immediate province—and offer some Remarks on the Book of *Chronicles*; whose purity, perfection, and excellency, Mr. *Baruh* is for ever extolling†. It has doubtless its merits; which chiefly consist in the useful *additions*, or *explanatory supplements* that are made to former accounts. But as to the order, elegance, and correctness of the composition, especially in its present state, I cannot help thinking that its *Advocate* over-rates it greatly—that he often mistakes its blemishes for beauties, and its defects for excellences. If I have any knowledge of the language, that knowledge directs me to conclude, that the Book is far from being so perfect as he has been pleased to represent it. Let us try it in a Collation he has considered at large; and where he seems to exult, as having cleared the whole of all its difficulties and contradictions. The Collation is the Eleventh; viz. that of

1 *Chr.* xx. 4—8. with 2 *Sam.* xxi. 18—22‡.

I shall not enter into a minute comparison of these passages; though they afford very ample matter for criticism: nor shall I dispute with Mr. B. the propriety of the method, by which he endeavours to reconcile their variations. That method, I own, I

* P. 26, &c.

† *Crit. Sacra exam.* p. 7, 8, 100, 101, &c.

‡ See *Crit. Sacra exam.* p. 99, &c.

cannot approve—And, looking upon the text in *both* places, as coming to us through the hands of men liable to mistakes, I think the variations may be accounted for, and the passages reconciled, in a much *easier*, and more *natural* manner.

I presume, that the *first* אַרְגִּים in 2 Sam. ver. 19. is, notwithstanding Mr. B's illustration, a wrong insertion inadvertently made by the Transcriber; and that, יַעֲרִי in *one* book, and יַעֲוֹר in the *other*, should be, as the *margin* in *Chronicles* reads, יַעֲיֹר. And then, how readily will the passages, allowing for easy mistakes, appear by *inspection* to accord! In the *English* indeed they seem to be utterly irreconcilable. For *Samuel* relates, that “Elhanan, the son of Iaare, “(Oregim,) a Bethlemite, slew Goliath the Gittite,” &c. And the Author of *Chronicles* says, that “Elhanan, the son of *Iair*, slew Lahmi the brother of “Goliath the Gittite,” &c. But let us put them in apposition according to the *original*, and then judge.

וַיַּךְ אֶלְחָנָן בֶּן יַעֲרִי בֵּית הַלְחָמִי אֶת Sam.

וַיַּךְ אֶלְחָנָן בֶּן יַעֲוֹר אֶת לַחְמִי אַחִי Chron.

גִּלְיָת הַגִּתִּי . Sam.

גִּלְיָת הַגִּתִּי . Chron.

Upon this view of the passages, “let the unprejudiced Critic now determine, whether he does not “see a manifest proof of corruption” in *Chronicles*. Here are but *two* words different; and those such as might easily be mistaken. אֶת and בֵּית are not far distant in orthography, and less in sound. The

ה before לחמ might be easily dropt. And though חח and חא be very similar; yet if the Reader should think 'חח not likely to be so mistaken, let him reflect that the ' may have been carelessly added; as כפ is written for חפ in this very place, ver. 4.

And then both passages will entirely agree in this uniform *literal* rendering. “*And Elhanan, the son of*”
 “*lair, a Bethlemite, slew Goliath the Gittite, the staff*”
 “*of whose spear was like a weaver’s beam*.*”

There are those, I know, who imagine the corruption to be in *Samuel*, and not in *Chronicles*. But their arguments are to me not convincing. The Copy, from which the *Latin Vulgate* was made, had evidently בית הלחמי in *Chronicles*; and wanted לחמ, the supposed name of the Giant; though it retained אח, “*the brother of Goliath* †.” It is said, “that the

* Mr. Barub takes it for granted (compare Coll. xi. p. 99. with Coll. xii. p. 26) “that *Elhanan*, the vanquisher of this giant, is “one and the same person with *Elhanan*, who is numbered among “*David’s* mighty men, in the College of Thirty: and he also “takes it for granted, that *this mighty deed* of his vanquishing a “giant, was the *cause* of his being installed in that College.”— That is, he takes it for granted, that a *deed* done at the end of *David’s* reign, was the *cause* that the person, who did it, obtained the honour of being installed in the College at the *beginning* of his reign: or, in other words, that a certain *cause* produced its *effect*, above 30 years at least before that cause existed. This, I confess, is a *new method* indeed of reconciling *Scripture variations*.

† *Versio Vulg. Lat. Paralip. I. cap. xx. 5.* Aliud quoque bellum gestum est adversus Philisthæos, in quo percussit Adeodatus (*Elhanan*) filius Saltus (*Jabiri*) BETHLEHEMITES fratrem Goliath Gethæi, &c.

“design of *Chronicles* was to throw light on the name “of the giant*.” But is it not more natural to suppose, that *Samuel* should *distinguish* this giant by the title of the *brother* of Goliath, when he had given us the history of *David’s* victory over that mighty man; than that the Author of *Chronicles* should do it, who never mentioned a word of the contest? But in truth, there was no *distinction* here intended by *either* of the sacred Writers: nor could any distinction be made between these Giants in point of kindred. If this supposed *Lahmi* was the *brother* of Goliath, so were they all†. For they were all the sons of one man, of the same Giant, גרפא, of *Gath*; and consequently all *Gittites*—Which takes away at once the whole force of the argument, that has been advanced on the phrase, “Goliath the Gittite;” as if the *Goliath* that *David* slew, was the only *Goliath* that could be of *Gath*. There were no less than *forty-five* years between *David’s* victory over *Goliath*, 1 *Sam.* xvii. and the battles here recorded; which happened but *three* years before *David’s* death. And if I might be allowed to hazard a conjecture, I would suppose, that the Giants here mentioned, were all the *sons*, and not the *brothers*, of *that Goliath*. This fairly accounts for *Ishbubenob’s* resentment against *David*†; and also for the conduct of the other *three*.

* *Crit. Sacra* exam. p. 103.

† Hence it appears, that גרפא is entirely superfluous; and should, as above noted, be turned into גר, correspondent to the parallel in *Samuel*.

‡ 2 *Sam.* xxi. 16, 17.

Though I have been drawn far into this point, it was by no means the point for which I produced the collation. I meant it should contribute to another end; and that is, to prove, that the Author of the book of *Chronicles* (supposing the present Text to be his genuine Transcript) must have copied very injudiciously from the ancient Records. For by inserting either too *little*, or too *much*, he has introduced an inconsistency into the account: and such an inconsistency, as the advocates for the integrity of the *Hebrew* Text will find, I believe, hard to be removed.

It is concluded 1 *Chron.* xx. 8. that the three Giants, mentioned in the preceding verses, “fell by the hand of David, and by the hand of his servants.” But how does it appear from the account here given, that *any one* of them fell by the hand of David? or that *any one* of them even encountered David? It is evident indeed they could not: for after his conflict with *Ishbibenob*, David, being old and unfit for war, was not permitted to fight any more. This account then, as it now stands, cannot be right. It wants something to render it *consistent*. Let us therefore see, whether any thing can be obtained from the parallel Text. Now the conclusion in 2 *Sam.* ver. 22. is, with the addition of a single word, exactly the same with this. “And these *four*—fell by the hand of David, and by the hand of his servants.” But this conclusion stands there well supported by the context. For *Samuel* speaks of *four* battles with the Philistines;

Philistines; in the *first* of which *David* engaged with *Ishbubenob* — and though he was not able to vanquish him, yet did he, we may presume, greatly weaken him; and thereby contribute to his speedier fall by the hand of *Abishai*, ver. 17. This sufficiently warrants the conclusion; and excludes the necessity of that *interpolation*, which the *Chaldee* Paraphrast thought proper to introduce into the 19th verse*; on purpose, it should seem, to obviate the objection made above. But the objection made above can, in my opinion, be no otherwise solved, than by frankly acknowledging, that the account of the *first* battle (2 Sam. xxi. 15—17.) was inadvertently omitted in the copy from which the present text of *Chronicles* was printed. This may be deduced not only from the *tenour* of the history—not only from the *abruptness* with which it begins in *Chronicles*: for וְהָיָה אַחֲרֵי כֵן, “And it came to pass after this,” cannot well connect two transactions, that happened at the distance of *fifteen* years from each other — But it may also be deduced from the word וַתַּעֲמֵד ver. 4. which should have been rendered, as in the margin of our Bibles, “And there *continued* war”—implying a *former* war

* In 2 Sam. xxi. 19. the *Chaldee* Paraphrase runs thus — Et fuit adhuc bellum in Gob cum Peliisthæis, et occidit *David*, filius *Jisai* textoris veli domus sanctuarii qui de *Betlehem*, Galiath Githæum, &c. How *David*, the son of *Jesse*, came to be inserted here instead of *Elbanan*, the son of *Jair*, is to me somewhat strange; unless it was to support the conclusion at the 22d verse—where it is said, “that one or more of these giants fell by the hand of *David*.”

or battle. This, however, is not all—The same may be further deduced from the *vestiges* that remain in the ancient Versions, of such a passage subsisting formerly in the book of *Chronicles*. The LXX record ver. 7. that the giants, who fought and fell, were *four*. Πάντες ἦσαν ΤΕΣΣΑΡΕΣ γίγαντες, καὶ ἔπεσον ἐν χειρὶ Δαυὶδ, καὶ ἐν χειρὶ παίδων αὐτοῦ. The Syriac version says, ver. 8. אַרְבַּע הָלִין—*Quatuor isti nati erant contumeliosæ in Gath, fractique sunt per manum Davidis, &c.* Hence then it is manifest, that the text of *Chronicles* is here imperfect; as it wants the account of the *first* of those four battles, which the *Israelites* fought with the Philistines: And by this defect it is become glaringly *inconsistent* with itself; as none of the Giants therein mentioned “fell by the “hand of David.”

But this is not the only Instance of the Imperfection of this Book. Several Facts are represented in it, in a manner *contradictory* to the *real state* of things. It is well known, that *Jehoshaphat* was in truth “king “of *Judah* :” And yet, it is expressly said, in 2 *Chron.* xxi. 2. that he was מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל, “king of *Israel*.” How can this be? and by what means is such a *contradiction* to be cleared up? Not by the flimsy arguments that have been *already* offered; nor by any *other* of the like stamp. I know but of one salvo in this case—which is, ingenuously to acknowledge, that the text is at present here corrupted. It is as *inconsistent* with the *truth* of things, as it is with the *ancient Versions*.

sions. For *all* the versions uniformly read in this place, “king of *Judah*” — which I am convinced was also the original reading in the *Hebrew*.

A similar instance occurs again in 2 *Chron.* xxviii. 19. The text says, that “the Lord brought *Judah* low, because of Ahaz, מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל, king of *Israel*: “for he made *Judah* naked,” &c. Now, in the first place, *Ahaz* was not king of *Israel*. Secondly, if he had been so, why should the Lord bring *Judah* low, because of the king of *Israel*? And, thirdly, how could the king of *Israel* make *Judah* naked, over whom he had no power? The passage then, as it stands at present, can never be brought to accord either with *reason*, or the *nature* of things. The *reading* therefore is faulty; and should be, “Ahaz king of *Ju-* “*dab*,” and not “king of *Israel*” — Which is confirmed, as well by the *state* of the world, as by all the *versions* without exception.

The like observation may be extended to other places: for these are not the only passages by many, where *Judah* and *Israel* are erroneously inserted, the one for the other. Let me add, that יְרוּשָׁלַם is put for דָּוִד in 2 *Chron.* xxv. 28. as appears by all the *Versions*, as well as by the parallel place in *Kings*. And יִשְׂרָאֵל seems to be redundant in 2 *Chron.* xxviii. 27. as it sounds somewhat odd, that “the sepulchres of “the kings of *Israel* should be in *Jerusalem*.”

Another instance of corruption may be observed in 2 *Chron.* xxii. 2. where the present text is full as inconsistent

consistent with the *nature* of things, as it is with the *tenour* of its corresponding passage. Here the Author records, "that Ahaziah was בן-ארבעים ושהים שנה " *forty and two years old*, when he began to reign." But in the 2d Book of *Kings*, viii. 26. he is said to be only בן-עשרים ושתים שנה, " *twenty and two years old*." What a glaring contradiction is here! One or other of these passages must be faulty; if ever there was a faulty passage in a book. Now let us examine, by the *state* of the case, and the *nature* of things, on which side the error lies. It appears both from *Chronicles* and *Kings*, that "Jehoram," the father of Ahaziah, "was thirty and two years old when he began to reign; and he reigned eight years." He died then at *forty*. And therefore his son, and especially his youngest son, who reigned immediately after him, could not possibly, in the order of nature, be, at his accession, *forty-two*. Hence then it follows, that the mistake must be in *Chronicles*, as the text now stands. But, to do the author of *Chronicles* justice, the fault is not *his*, but his *Transcriber's*. For the *original* reading was *here*, as well as in *Kings*, not ארבעים but עשרים: the Syriac and Arabic Versions having in this place *twenty-two* years; and the LXX, according to some Copies, *twenty* years, but according to others, *twenty-two*—in exact conformity with the parallel passage.

But the ancient Versions, we are told, cannot be depended upon: nor is there any necessity to refer to

them on this occasion. Both texts are perfectly right : and the great variation between them may be easily reconciled in the following manner—"The 22 years, ascribed to Ahaziah in the book of *Kings*, were the years of his real age : but the 42 years, ascribed to him in *Chronicles*, are the years, not of his age, but of his nomination to the crown ; to be computed from the time his father *Jehoram* was declared prince royal*." Now *Jehoram* died at forty : and therefore, by *this* account, his son was declared Heir-apparent to the crown *two* years before his father was born—that is, in plain terms, he was appointed to be king, before it could possibly be known, whether he himself, or even his father, would ever come into existence. If this be to *explain* Scripture, I know not what it is to *expose* it. For surely, no illustration can expose it more, than that which sets it in direct opposition to common sense, and to the common course of nature.

There is another corruption of the same kind, which may be easily discovered by comparing 2 *Kings* xxiv. 8. with 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 9. For the book of *Kings* says, that "Jehoiachin was בן-שמונה עשרה שנה "eighteen years old, when he began to reign;" and the book of *Chronicles*, that he was only eight—בן-שמונה שנים.

"This difference," my opponent says, "may be reconciled upon the same principles as are advanced

* *Crit. Sacra* exam. p. 144.

“ in the former collation *”—that is, upon principles which render the Scripture *ridiculous*. But the Scripture, in truth, was originally subject to no such imputation. For the copies, from which the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions were made, read here, *eighteen*, in perfect agreement with the book of *Kings*. And I appeal to any man of sense and candor, whether it would not, in all these and the like cases, be more conformable to right Reason, as well as more honourable to the real dignity of Scripture itself, that its advocates should rather acknowledge the obvious mistakes and errors of Transcribers, than stiffly contest for the integrity and perfection of the *present* Text—which yet they cannot possibly defend, without running into greater absurdities, than those they labour to reconcile. This is not the opinion of myself alone: it is also the opinion of a much greater man; which I shall deliver in his own words: “ Si quid ego video
 “ aut intelligo,” says the learned *Perizonius*, “ multo
 “ rectius divinitati et auctoritati Scripturæ Sacræ con-
 “ sulunt, qui vitium istius librorum in re per se levi
 “ agnoscunt, quam qui difficultatem volunt tollere,
 “ contortis, violentis, et absonis interpretationibus;
 “ quæ ab ipsa Scriptoris locutione, et clarissima syn-
 “ taxi longissime recedunt; immo pro lubitu mutant
 “ sententiæ subiectum & prædicatum. Exempli gratia,
 “ quando 2 Reg. viii. 26. & 2 Paralip. xxii. 2.
 “ eadem plane verba, nisi quod solo in numero discre-

* *Crit. Sacra exam.* p. 203.

“ pent,

"pent, leguntur in Hebraica Scriptura: *Filius* $\frac{4}{2}$
 "annorum erat *Ebazia*, quum regnare inciperet, & re-
 "gnavit unum annum; et nomen matris ejus erat *Atha-*
 "lia, filia *Omri*: quis erit, qui rem sedulo & absque
 "præjudicio considerans, non multo rectius autuma-
 "bit consultum auctoritati Sacrorum Codicum, ac
 "longe minus exponi eos cavillationibus impiorum, si
 "utroque in loco eadem verba eodem etiam modo inter-
 "pretemur, eoque sensu, quem aperte præ se ferunt, ac
 "tantum librariorum à vero numero in loco Paralip.
 "aberrantium agnoscamus lapsum, quam ut eadem
 "verba, tam non ambigua, in uno loco longe aliter
 "explicemus, quam in altero, & ita quidem, ut, tur-
 "bata omni constructione & ordine, subjectum ora-
 "tionis quod manifeste est, & in altero loco esse agnos-
 "citur, *Abaza*, faciamus, vel cum *Usserio Athalia*,
 "vel cum *Junio & Tremellio Omrium*, hoc modo &
 "ordine, *Abaziae Matri nomen Athalia, nata Homri,*
 "agens, ut *Ille*, vel *agentis*, ut *Hi* ad *Omrium* hoc
 "referentes, *quadagesimum secundum annum, quum*
 "*Achazia regnaret, qui anno uno regnavit Jeruschalai-*
 "*mis.* Hoccine est interpretari, & non potius omnia
 "turbare, atque impiis ansam præbere cavillandi,
 "quasi in Textu Sacro quid tradatur, non librario-
 "rum, sed ipsius Auctoris, culpa, quod minus sit
 "verum, quodque ideo tam absurda & contorta para-
 "phrasi involvi & occultari debeat? Quanto fatius
 "erat, verbis tam claris relinquere suam syntaxin
 "suumque sensum, quem iisdem in priore etiam tri-

“ buimus loco, & hic in librariorum manus omnem
 “ conferre istius discrepantiæ culpam, quas sæpe
 “ errasse, non tantum ex profanis Auctoribus, verum
 “ etiam ex Novo Testamento, & tot ejus variis Lec-
 “ tionibus, certissimum est, & in confesso *”.

If therefore the Learned, knowing the natural frailties of Transcribers, had but candor enough, fairly to acknowledge they might sometimes err; and if they would read the Scripture with that allowance; how easily might they illustrate several passages, which at present either carry no meaning at all; or a meaning inconsistent with the parallel accounts. I will instance in a collation, which Mr. B. has taken some trouble to explain †—and which yet, by sticking to the letter of the text, he has been obliged to leave as obscure as he found it. We read 2 Sam. vi. 2. that “ David arose, and went with all the people that “ were with him **מבעלי יהודה** FROM Baale of Judah, “ to bring up from thence the ark of God.” In the parallel place, 1 Chron. xiii. 6. it is said, that “ David went up, and all Israel, **בעלתה**, to Baalah, “ (to Kirjath-jearim) which *belongeth* to Judah, to “ bring up from thence the ark of God.” Now it is evident at first sight, that the text in *Samuel* must be wrong. For David could not go *from* Baale, to bring *from thence* the ark of God. Instead therefore of the word **מבעלי**, let us read **לבעלי**, or rather **לבעלה**,

* Præf. ad Ælian. Var. Hist.

† Coll. vi. p. 78—80.

to Baalah; ("which," says *Joshua* xv. 9. is Kirjath-jearim) and the whole becomes at once clear and consistent.—One would be apt to suspect, that אל קרית-יערים in *Chronicles*, was at first a marginal Gloss; afterwards erroneously introduced into the text. But of this let the Reader judge.

In the same manner the difference between בת-שוע and בת-עמיאל, "Bath-shua the daughter of Ammiel," as we read 1 *Chron.* iii. 5. and בת-שבע בת-אליעם, "Bath-sheba the daughter of Eliam," 2 *Sam.* xi. 3. may, I think, be more easily and naturally accounted for, by admitting some slight mistakes in the text, than by running into those fanciful and groundless etymologies, which Mr. B. recommends for the reconciliation of the passages*. The two last words, עמיאל and אליעם, consist precisely of the same letters; and become uniform by transposition. The ב and ו in the words שבע and שוע, being both letters of the same organ, might have been changed either by mistake or by design. The Author of *Chronicles*, though he writes in *Hebrew*, is far from being a good *Hebraean*. He often introduces the kindred dialects into his language; especially the *Chaldee* and *Syriac*. Thus he writes תגלת-פלאסר for תלגת-פלנסר †. גרשון for גרשום ‡. דרמשק for דרמשק §. and בני-מלא for בני-מלא.

* *Crit. Sacra* exam. p. 47, &c.

† Compare 1 *Chron.* v. 26. with 2 *Kings* xv. 29.

‡ 1 *Chron.* vi. 16, 17, &c. xv. 7. xxii. 15, 16, &c.

§ 1 *Chron.* xviii. 5, 6, &c. 2 *Chron.* xvi. 2. xxviii. 5. 23.

for *בן-מלה* *. &c. Nay, it appears, that he sometimes adopted even the phraseology of the Greeks; for *רפסדות* *Rapsodoth*, 2 *Chron.* ii. 16. is evidently derived, to speak in the words of Grotius, “ex Græco *ῥαψῳδία*, quod *contexturam carminum* significat, translatum ad *ratium contexturam*.”

These and such like peculiarities of style Mr. *Barub* should have noted — should moreover have properly explained. For though they are no corruptions, they are nevertheless manifest proofs that the Author was not that accurate and elegant Writer he seems to have taken him for. Nor indeed was it possible he should be: since it is well known, that he composed this Book, when the *Hebrew* language was not only upon the decline, but had ceased to be vulgarly spoken.

And this leads me to another observation, with which I shall close the subject before us. If the *Hebrew* language was at this time so little known and understood by the *Jews*, as *Ezra* himself represents it to have been; what wonder is it, that the Transcripts then made should be less correct, and less perfect, than those which were made in *more knowing* times? and will not this clearly account for the *later* Books being fuller of *Keri's* than the *former*?

What has been said is sufficient, I think, to convince all candid and equitable Judges of the *erroneousness* and *imperfection* of the printed *Hebrew* Text—

* Compare 2 *Chron.* xviii. 7, 8. with 1 *Kings* xxii. 8, 9.

and of the *utility* of collating *parallel* passages, as the means of *discovering* and *correcting* mistakes. I must not however expect, that the prejudices of my opponent and those of his persuasion should be so easily removed. But nevertheless, I am not without hopes, that, when the *Jews* come to observe the vast multitude of *various Readings*, which Dr. Kennicott has collected, chiefly from their own manuscripts, their high preconceived opinion of the absolute *integrity* of the *Hebrew* Scriptures will gradually subside; and leave them at last open to the influence of this just Conclusion—that the *sacred* Books, as well as others, have, in their descent to us, contracted many and great faults through the ignorance or carelessness of Transcribers.

T H E E N D.

Lately published, Price 1 s. stitched in Blue Paper,

CRITICA SACRA; or, A Short Introduction to Hebrew Criticism: In which, 1. The correspondent Passages of Scripture are disposed under proper Heads; and, 2. The Method of discovering and correcting thereby the various Errors of the printed Text is set forth and illustrated. By the Rev. Dr. Henry Owen.

"This pamphlet, though small in quantity, is rich in merit. It contains more useful matter than is to be found in many a bulky volume. It opens a vein of valuable and copious criticism to those who study the sacred literature of the Old Testament; on which account, it cannot be too warmly recommended to their notice." Monthly Review for 1774.

Printed for W. Bowyer and J. Nichols, at Cicero's Head,
Red Lion Passage, Fleet Street.

Where may be likewise had,

1. Dr. Owen's Dissertation on the Four Gospels. Price 2 s. 6 d.
2. His Enquiry into the Septuagint Version. Price 2 s. 6 d.
3. The Origin of Printing; in Two Essays:

1. The Substance of Dr. Middleton's Dissertation. With Remarks.

2. Mr. Meerman's Account of the first Invention of the Art:

With an Appendix, on the first-printed Greek and Hebrew Books; the early Polyglott Bibles, &c. &c. Price 3 s. sewed.

4. Select Discourses: 1. Of the Correspondence of the Hebrew Months with the Julian; from the Latin of Professor Michaelis. 2. Of the Sabbatical Year; from the same. 3. Of the Years of Jubilee; from an Anonymous Writer, in Masson's *Histoire Critique de la Republic des Lettres*. Price 1 s. 6 d.

5. A Short History of the Israelites: with an Account of their Manners, Customs, Laws, Polity, and Religion. Being an useful Introduction to the Reading of the Old Testament. Translated from the French of Abbé Fleury, Author of the Ecclesiastical History, by Ellis Farnsworth, M. A. Price 3 s.

6. Six Occasional Discourses in the Royal Navy, by the Rev. Michael Philipps, Chaplain in His Majesty's Ship the *Terrible*. Price 2 s. 6 d. sewed.

7. Bishop Clayton's Speech on the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds; his Essay on Spirit; Thoughts on Self-love; Journal to Grand Cairo, &c. &c.

* * Dr. Owen's Sermons at Boyle's Lectures were lately published by J. and F. Rivington.

